arXiv:cond-mat/0011321v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 19 Dec 2000

The second law of Thermodynamics as a theorem in quantum mechanics

Hal Tasaki
Department of Physics, Gakushuin University, Mejiro, Toshima-ku, Tokyo 171, JAPAN

Abstract

We treat a quantum mechanical system with certain general properties which are expected to be common in macroscopic quantum systems. Starting from a *pure* initial state (which may not describe an equilibrium) in which energy is mildly concentrated at a single value, we consider a time evolution determined by a time-dependent Hamiltonian as a model of an adiabatic operation in thermodynamics. We take a family of operations with the same procedure and various "waiting times." Then the *minimum work principle* is rigorously proved for almost all choices of the waiting time.

To develop a microscopic understanding of the second law of thermodynamics [1], which is one of the most perfect macroscopic laws in physics, has been an unsolved fundamental problem. If one puts aside the problem of "thermalization" and starts from equilibrium states in the sense of statistical mechanics, then one can reasonably derive the second law in some situations [2, 3].

In the present paper, we make a further step by discussing a rigorous derivation of the second law directly from quantum mechanics without referring to statistical mechanics. More precisely, we model *adiabatic operation* in thermodynamics as a time evolution according to a time dependent Hamiltonian [5] in a closed quantum mechanical system. We assume that the system has certain general properties (such as the existence of extensive entropy, nondegeracy and non-resonance of the energy eigenvalues) which we expect to be common in macroscopic systems. We take the initial state to be a *pure* state in which the energy is concentrated at a single value, but not too sharply. We consider a family of operations with the same procedure but with various "waiting times." Then we prove, for large enough systems, an inequality corresponding to the *minimum work principle* for almost all choices of the waiting time. The initial state may or may not correspond to a macroscopic equilibrium state. Thus we are dealing also with the problem of "thermalization" (although in an indirect and incomplete manner).

Setup and main results: We consider a quantum mechanical system characterized by a single parameter $V > 0$ (the volume) which can be made as large as one wishes. For each V we fix two Hamiltonians H_{init} and H_{fin} which have (infinite) discrete eigenvalues E_j and E'_j ($j = 1, 2, \ldots$), respectively. We assume $E_j < E_{j+1}$ and $0 \le E'_j \le E'_{j+1}$ for any j. (For simplicity, we do not make explicit the V-dependence of the Hamiltonians, the energy eigenvalues, and the eigenstates.) We have assumed the energy eigenvalues of H_{init} to be nondegenerate. We further assume that these eigenvalues satisfy the *non-resonance* *condition*, i.e., $E_j - E_k = E_\ell - E_m \neq 0$ implies $j = \ell$ and $k = m$. We expect that a generic Hamiltonian of a macroscopic quantum systems satisfy these conditions [6].

We assume that H_{init} and H_{fin} have well-behaved thermodynamic limits as $V \to \infty$ in the following sense. Define the number of states $\Omega_V(E)$ to be the number of eigenvalues E_j of H_{init} such that $E_j \leq E$. We assume that there are V-independent constants $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, a, b, and a smooth increasing function $s(\cdot)$, and the number of states satisfy

$$C_1 V^a \exp\left[V\, s\left(\frac{E}{V}\right)\right] \leq \Omega_V(E) \leq C_2 V^b \exp\left[V\, s\left(\frac{E}{V}\right)\right], \tag{1}$$

which is an expected behavior in a macroscopic system with the (infinite volume) entropy $s(\epsilon) = \lim_{V\to\infty} V^{-1} \log \Omega_V(V\epsilon)$. We also assume that there are V-independent smooth functions $f(\cdot)$, $g_1(\cdot)$ and

$$\left|\frac{E'_j}{V} - f\left(\frac{E_j}{V}\right)\right| \leq \frac{1}{V}\, g_1\left(\frac{E_j}{V}\right), \tag{2}$$

for any j. (Throughout the present paper, $g_i(\cdot)$ is a function which appears as an unimportant coefficient of a "small" term.)

In order to describe an adiabatic operation of an outside agent to the system, we choose (for a fixed V) an arbitrary time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_0(\cdot)$ such that $H_0(0) = H_{\mathrm{init}}$ and $H_0(T) = H_{\mathrm{fin}}$. For an arbitrary $\tau \geq 0$, consider the same operation executed after a "waiting time" of τ, which is described by the Hamiltonian $H_\tau(\cdot)$ defined as

$$H_\tau(t) = \begin{cases} H_{\mathrm{init}} & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau; \\ H_0(t-\tau) & \text{for } \tau \leq t \leq T+\tau. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

It is essential in our approach to investigate the family of operations with a fixed $H_0(\cdot)$ and various "waiting time" τ.

For a fixed $\tau \geq 0$, let $U_\tau(\cdot)$ be the solution of $i\partial U_\tau(t)/\partial t = H_\tau(t) U_\tau(t)$, and define $U_\tau = U_\tau(T+\tau)$ which is the unitary operator representing the whole operation.

Let φ_j and φ'_j be the normalized eigenstates of the Hamiltonians H_{init} and H_{fin}, respectively, with eigenvalues E_j and E'_j. Then we define a unitary operator U_{slow} by $U_{\mathrm{slow}}\varphi_j = \varphi'_j$. Recalling the "adiabatic theorem" in quantum mechanics, one may interpret U_{slow} as describing the time evolution in an operation where the Hamiltonian changes from H_{init} to H_{fin} in an infinitely slow manner.

We assume that the system is initially in a normalized pure state φ_{init}, and require that, in φ_{init}, *the energy is concentrated around a single value, but not too sharply*. (It is trivial to extend all the results to mixed initial states.) More precisely we expand it as $\varphi_{\mathrm{init}} = \sum_j \xi_j \varphi_j$, where ξ_j are complex coefficients, and assume that

$$\xi_j = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \left|\frac{E_j}{V} - \epsilon_0\right| \geq C_3 V^{-\delta} \tag{4}$$

where ϵ_0, $C_3 > 0$, and $0 < \delta < 1$ are (V-independent) constants, and

$$|\xi_j|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V)} \tag{5}$$

for any j. Note that this upper bound for $|\xi_j|^2$ is quite mild since the number of allowed basis states (which is $\Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V + C_3 V^{1-\delta}) - \Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V - C_3 V^{1-\delta})$) is much larger than $\Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V)$ if V is large. (From (1), we find it is larger by a factor of $\exp(C_3 s'(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta})$.) There is a huge freedom in the choice of ξ_j within the restrictions (4) and (5). In particular, we are *not* assuming anything like all the eigenstates with energies in a finite range appear with equal weights. We expect that generic macroscopic states (which, unlike Schrödinger's cat states, have more or less determined energies) automatically posses similar properties [7].

Now suppose that the system is initially in the state φ_{init}, and one measures the energy (described by H_{fin}) after the operation. The energy expectation value after the "slow" operation is

$$E_{\mathrm{slow}} = \langle \varphi_{\mathrm{init}}, U_{\mathrm{slow}}^{-1} H_{\mathrm{fin}} U_{\mathrm{slow}} \varphi_{\mathrm{init}} \rangle = \sum_j |\xi_j|^2 E'_j. \tag{6}$$

and that after the operation described by H_τ is

$$E_\tau = \langle \varphi_{\mathrm{init}}, U_\tau^{-1} H_{\mathrm{fin}} U_\tau \varphi_{\mathrm{init}} \rangle. \tag{7}$$

Then our result is as follows.

Theorem: Take an arbitrary family of models with H_{init}, H_{fin}, $H_0(\cdot)$, and φ_{init} satisfying all the conditions stated above. Then for sufficiently large V, there exist $\tau_{\max}$ and a subset $I \subset [0, \tau_{\max}]$ such that

$$\frac{|I|}{\tau_{\max}} \geq 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{V\, s(\epsilon_0)}{2}\right], \tag{8}$$

where $|I|$ denotes the "total length" of the set I, and for any $\tau \in I$ we have

$$\frac{E_\tau}{V} \geq \frac{E_{\mathrm{slow}}}{V} - g_2(\epsilon_0) V^{-\delta} \tag{9}$$

where $g_2(\cdot)$ is a (V-independent) function which depend only on C_1, C_2, a, b, δ, $s(\cdot)$, $f(\cdot)$, and $g_1(\cdot)$.

The theorem says that the inequality (9) holds unless one happens to choose the "waiting time" τ from a very exceptional set $[0, \tau_{\max}] \backslash I$. Since the proportion of the exceptional set is exponentially small in V, there is practically no chance of observing the violation of (9) when V is large (provided that one takes the waiting time long enough).

Now the inequality (9) implies

$$\frac{W_\tau}{V} \geq \frac{W_{\mathrm{slow}}}{V} - g_2(\epsilon_0) V^{-\delta}, \tag{10}$$

where $W_\tau = E_\tau - \langle \varphi_{\mathrm{init}}, H_{\mathrm{init}} \varphi_{\mathrm{init}} \rangle$ and $W_{\mathrm{slow}} = E_{\mathrm{slow}} - \langle \varphi_{\mathrm{init}}, H_{\mathrm{init}} \varphi_{\mathrm{init}} \rangle$ are the works done by the agent to the system during the operations. When V is large, the inequality (10) becomes $W_\tau / V \gtrsim W_{\mathrm{slow}} / V$, which is nothing but the *minimum work principle* [9] (for a closed system) in thermodynamics [8]. Since the minimum work principle is expected to hold for an arbitrary operation applied on a thermodynamic equilibrium state, the present result shows (although in an indirect manner) that an equilibrium is attained after sufficiently long "waiting time" [10].

We note that the minimum work principle for closed systems is one of the fundamental forms of the second law for simple systems, and other forms (such as the Kelvin's principle or the law of entropy increase) can be derived from it by suitable thermodynamic arguments. Moreover this form of the second law does not rely on definitions of heat or entropy, which are always delicate. It depends solely on the notion of energy transfer which is the ultimate object to be studied in thermodynamics.

Proof: From (6), (4), and (2), we see

$$\frac{E_{\rm slow}}{V} \le f(\epsilon_0 + C_3 V^{-\delta}) + \frac{g_1(\epsilon_0 + C_3 V^{-\delta})}{V}, \tag{11}$$

which implies

$$\frac{E_{\rm slow}}{V} \le \frac{\bar{E}}{V} + g_3(\epsilon_0) V^{-\delta}, \tag{12}$$

where $\bar{E} = V f(\epsilon_0)$, and $g_3(\cdot)$ is a V-independent function.

Since $H_{\rm fin}$ is unbounded in general, we introduce a bounded operator $\tilde{H} = \bar{E}(1-P) + H_{\rm fin} P$ where P is the orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by φ'_j with j such that $E'_j \le \bar{E} = V f(\epsilon_0)$. $\tilde{H}$ behaves exactly as $H_{\rm fin}$ for energies lower than $\bar{E}$, and behaves as a constant otherwise. Let $\tilde{E}_\tau = \langle \varphi_{\rm init}, U_\tau^{-1} \tilde{H} U_\tau \varphi_{\rm init} \rangle$. Since $H_{\rm fin} \ge \tilde{H}$, we have $E_\tau \ge \tilde{E}_\tau$. We shall prove (9) with E_τ replaced by $\tilde{E}_\tau$, which automatically leads to the desired result for E_τ.

By noting that $U_\tau = U_0 \exp(-i H_{\rm init} \tau)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_\tau &= \sum_{j,j'} \xi_j^* \xi_{j'} \langle \varphi_j, U_\tau^{-1} \tilde{H} U_\tau \varphi_{j'} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,j'} \xi_j^* \xi_{j'} \exp[i(E_j - E_{j'})\tau] \langle \varphi_j, U_0^{-1} \tilde{H} U_0 \varphi_{j'} \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

For a function f_τ of τ, we denote its "long-(waiting-)time" average as

$$\overline{f_\tau} = \lim_{S\to\infty} \frac{1}{S} \int_0^S d\tau\, f_\tau. \tag{14}$$

Since the assumption of nondegeneracy implies $\overline{e^{i(E_j - E_{j'})\tau}} = \delta_{j,j'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau} &= \sum_j |\xi_j|^2 \langle \varphi_j, U_0^{-1} \tilde{H} U_0 \varphi_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,k} |\xi_j|^2 \langle \varphi_j, U_0^{-1} \varphi'_k \rangle \langle \varphi'_k, \tilde{H} \varphi'_k \rangle \langle \varphi'_k, U_0 \varphi_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,k} |\xi_j|^2 \alpha_{j,k} \tilde{E}'_k, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\alpha_{j,k} = |\langle\varphi_j, U_0^{-1}\varphi'_k\rangle|^2$, and $\tilde{E}'_k = \langle\varphi'_k, \tilde{H}\varphi'_k\rangle = \min\{E'_k, \bar{E}\}$. Because of the unitarity, $(\alpha_{j,k})$ is a doubly stochastic matrix [11], i.e., it satisfies $0 \le \alpha_{j,k} \le 1$ and $\sum_j \alpha_{j,k} = \sum_k \alpha_{j,k} = 1$. Let $j(\cdot)$ be a permutation of integers such that $|\xi_{j(\ell)}| \ge |\xi_{j(\ell+1)}|$. Then one can easily prove [12] that

$$\overline{\tilde{E}_\tau} = \sum_{j,k} |\xi_j|^2 \alpha_{j,k} \tilde{E}'_k \ge \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\xi_{j(k)}|^2 \tilde{E}'_k. \tag{16}$$

Let $\Omega_- = \Omega_V(V\epsilon_0 - C_3 V^{1-\delta})$. Then, by using (16), (2), $\bar{E} = V f(\epsilon_0)$, (5), (1), and (12), we can estimate the average $\overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\tilde{E}_\tau} &\ge \sum_{k=\Omega_-}^{\infty} |\xi_{j(k)}|^2 \tilde{E}'_k \\
&\ge \tilde{E}'_{\Omega_-} \sum_{k=\Omega_-}^{\infty} |\xi_{j(k)}|^2 \\
&\ge \{V f(\epsilon_0 - C_3 V^{-\delta}) - g_1(\epsilon_0 - C_3 V^{-\delta})\} \sum_{k=\Omega_-}^{\infty} |\xi_{j(k)}|^2 \\
&\ge \{\bar{E} - g_4(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta}\} \left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{\Omega_- -1} |\xi_{j(k)}|^2\right) \\
&\ge \{\bar{E} - g_4(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta}\} \left\{1 - \frac{\Omega_V(V\epsilon_0 - C_3 V^{1-\delta})}{\Omega_V(V\epsilon_0)}\right\} \\
&\ge \{\bar{E} - g_4(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta}\} \left\{1 - \frac{C_2}{C_1} V^{b-a} \exp[-V\{s(\epsilon_0) - s(\epsilon_0 - C_3 V^{-\delta})\}]\right\} \\
&\ge \{\bar{E} - g_4(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta}\} \left\{1 - \frac{C_2}{C_1} V^{b-a} \exp[-g_5(\epsilon) V^{1-\delta}]\right\} \\
&\ge \bar{E} - g_6(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta} \\
&\ge E_{\mathrm{slow}} - g_7(\epsilon_0) V^{1-\delta},
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for sufficiently large V, where $g_i(\cdot)$ are V-independent functions.

In order to convert the above bound for the average into information about $\tilde{E}_\tau$ itself [13], we evaluate the variance and follow the standard argument in the proof of Chebyshev inequality [14].

From (13), we see that

$$(\tilde{E}_\tau)^2 = \sum_{j,k,\ell,m} \xi_j^* \, \xi_k \, \xi_\ell^* \, \xi_m \, e^{i(E_j - E_k + E_\ell - E_m)\tau} \, h(j,k) \, h(\ell,m), \tag{18}$$

where $h(j,j') = \langle\varphi_j, U_0^{-1}\tilde{H}U_0\varphi_{j'}\rangle$. From the non-resonance condition for the spectrum of H_{init}, we see that the average $\overline{e^{i(E_j - E_k + E_\ell - E_m)\tau}}$ is equal to 1 when $j = k$, $\ell = m$ or $j = m$, $k = \ell$, and is vanishing otherwise. This means that

$$\overline{(\tilde{E}_\tau)^2} = \left\{\sum_j |\xi_j|^2 h(j,j)\right\}^2 + \sum_{j \ne j'} |\xi_j|^2 |\xi_{j'}|^2 h(j,j') h(j',j). \tag{19}$$

Noting that the first term in the right-hand side is equal to $\left(\overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}\right)^2$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\left(\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}\right)^2} &= \overline{(\tilde{E}_\tau)^2} - \left(\overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}\right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{j \neq j'} |\xi_j|^2 |\xi_{j'}|^2 h(j, j') h(j', j) \\
&\le \left\{ \max_{j'} |\xi_{j'}|^2 \right\} \sum_{j,j'} |\xi_j|^2 \langle \varphi_j, U_0^{-1} \tilde{H} U_0 \varphi_{j'} \rangle \langle \varphi_{j'}, U_0^{-1} \tilde{H} U_0 \varphi_j \rangle \\
&= \left\{ \max_{j'} |\xi_{j'}|^2 \right\} \sum_{j} |\xi_j|^2 \langle \varphi_j, U_0^{-1} \tilde{H}^2 U_0 \varphi_j \rangle \\
&\le \frac{\bar{E}^2}{\Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V)}, \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5) and $\tilde{H} \le \bar{E}$. Since $\left(\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}\right)^2$ is continuous in τ, we see that for sufficiently large $\tau_{\max}$

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\max}} \int_0^{\tau_{\max}} d\tau \left(\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}\right)^2 \le \frac{2\,\bar{E}^2}{\Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V)}. \qquad (21)$$

Define

$$I = \{\tau \mid 0 \le \tau \le \tau_{\max}, |\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}| \le C_4 V^{1-\delta}\}. \qquad (22)$$

Let $\chi[\text{true}] = 1$ and $\chi[\text{false}] = 0$. Then, by noting that $\chi[|x| \ge x_0] \le (x/x_0)^2$, and using (21) and (1), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \frac{\mu[I]}{\tau_{\max}} &= \frac{1}{\tau_{\max}} \int_0^{\tau_{\max}} d\tau\, \chi[|\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}| \ge C_4 V^{1-\delta}] \\
&\le \frac{1}{\tau_{\max}} \int_0^{\tau_{\max}} d\tau \left\{ \frac{\tilde{E}_\tau - \overline{\tilde{E}_\tau}}{C_4 V^{1-\delta}} \right\}^2 \\
&\le \left(\frac{\bar{E}}{V}\right)^2 \frac{2\,V^{2\delta}}{(C_4)^2\, \Omega_V(\epsilon_0 V)} \\
&\le \{f(\epsilon_0)\}^2 \frac{2\,V^{2\delta - a}}{C_1 (C_4)^2} \exp[-V\, s(\epsilon_0)] \\
&\le \exp\left[-\frac{V\, s(\epsilon_0)}{2}\right], \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

where the final bound is valid for sufficiently large V. This is the bound (8) for the size of the exceptional set. Recalling (17), we have proved the desired theorem with $g_2(\cdot) = g_7(\cdot) + C_4$.

It is a pleasure to thank Elliott Lieb, Takayuki Miyadera, Hiroshi Nagaoka, Shin-ichi Sasa, Akira Shimizu, and Jakob Yngvason for useful discussions on related topics.

References

[1] See, for example, E. H. Lieb and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rep. **310**, 1 (1999); Physics Today, April 2000, p. 32.

[2] A. Lenard, J. Stat. Phys. **19**, 575 (1978). In this paper, it was shown that passivity (the minimum work principle for cycles) and other conditions can completely *characterize* the Gibbs states. We note, however, that this work lacks the view point of micro-macro separation. By the same argument, one can prove the (macroscopic) second law for a much wider class of distributions. See [4]. See also W. Pusz and S. L. Woronowicz, Commun. Math. Phys. **58**, 273 (1978), W. Thirring, *Quantum Mechanics of Large Systems* (Springer, 1983).

[3] C. Jarzynski, J. Stat. Phys. **96**, 415 (1999). M. H. Partovi, Phys. Lett. A, **137**, 440 (1989). (We, however, do not agree with Partovi's (2) since the von Neumann entropy may not return to its original value in a thermodynamic cycle. See [4].) B. Piechocinska, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062314 (2000).

[4] H. Tasaki, to be published.

[5] We imagine that an outside agent changes some of the controllable parameters (such as external fields or the positions of walls) in the Hamiltonian according to a fixed procedure. We note that a general adiabatic operation in thermodynamics [1] may not simply fit into such a scheme. In reality an agent is even allowed to make an observation and change the procedure according to information thus obtained.

[6] Obviously many simple noninteracting systems do not satisfy these conditions. We nevertheless expect that the degeneracies and the resonances in such models are removed as soon as nontrivial interactions are turned on. We also note that it is possible to allow some amount of degeneracies and resonances by making appropriate modifications in the proof.

[7] We note that a rather artificial nature of our conditions is not really necessary for our proof. With more careful estimates, we can treat models with much milder conditions.

[8] We expect, for not too radical operations, $U_\tau\varphi_{\rm init}$ possesses properties similar to that we imposed on $\varphi_{\rm init}$, and hence our derivation of the minimum work principle can be extended to the next operation where $U_\tau\varphi_{\rm init}$ plays the role of initial state. (But it seems that proofs of this claim should be done for specific models.)

[9] In order to give a thermodynamic interpretation, we are implicitly assuming that the works are extensive and have small fluctuation. The inequality itself is of course valid without the assumption.

[10] This suggests that the role of the waiting time is to let the system relax to an equilibrium. We note, however, that the introduction of τ is necessary even when the initial state φ_{init} already corresponds to an equilibrium (from a macroscopic point of view). This is because, for any give φ_{init}, one can construct a special (probably highly unphysical and hard-to-realize) unitary transformation which violates the second law. By considering operations with various τ, we are excluding such a transformation.

[11] See, for example, R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis* (Springer, 1997).

[12] This type of inequality plays an important role in [2]. *Proof:* A doubly stochastic matrix $\alpha_{j,k}$ can be decomposed as $\alpha_{j,k} = \sum_\ell a_\ell \, p_{j,k}^{(\ell)}$ where $0 \le a_\ell \le 1$, $\sum_\ell a_\ell = 1$, and each $(p_{j,k}^{(\ell)})$ is a permutation matrix [11]. Since one trivially has $\sum_{j,k} |\xi_j|^2 p_{j,k}^{(\ell)} \tilde{E}'_k \ge \sum_k |\xi_{j(k)}|^2 \tilde{E}'_k$ for a permutation matrix, the desired inequality follows.

[13] The most essential observation is that the summation of the terms with $j \neq j'$ in the right-hand side of (13) do not have significant contribution in general because of rapid phase oscillations. Since it is extremely difficult to make this observation directly into a controlled estimate, we instead examine the variance. The similar technique was used in H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1373 (1998).

[14] See, for example, W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications I*, (Wiley, 1968)